



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sequently, also, to the integrity of this sacrament two things concur, scil. spiritual food and spiritual drink."<sup>1</sup>

We observe, further, that the *very nature of sacraments*, as positive ordinances deriving their efficacy from their divine institution, and from it alone, prohibits any deviation from the original institution except in cases where an exact conformity is either physically impossible, as *e. g.*, where no wine can be procured; or, for weighty reasons, unadvisable, *e. g.*, when the administering of wine to a sick person might be attended with dangerous consequences. In extraordinary cases of this kind we are justified in deviating from the strict letter of the institution, and we believe that, notwithstanding such deviation, the full spiritual benefits of the sacrament will be graciously vouchsafed by Him who "looketh not on the outward appearance, but on the heart."<sup>2</sup> But what may be done or has been done on extraordinary occasions cannot justify the deliberate and unnecessary alteration of what are plainly the essential parts of a sacrament, when no inevitable impediments to the exact performance of the rite exist. This was the view of the matter taken by the early Fathers. The words of Cyprian, especially, are so express and pertinent to the subject that we shall make no apology for quoting them. Cyprian, speaking of the practice of using water instead of wine, which had been employed by a certain sect of Christians in his day, who thence were termed *Aquarii*, condemns it most severely. "Know," says he, "that we are admonished that, in offering the cup, the tradition of the Lord is to be observed, and that nothing else should be done by us than what the Lord has first done for us."<sup>3</sup> And again, in the same epistle, he says, and, if possible, still more emphatically: "But if it be not lawful to break even the least of the Lord's commands, how much more is it unlawful [as none exist] to infringe such great ones, so sublime, so much appertaining to the very sacrament of our Lord's passion and our redemption, or to change it by human tradition into anything else but what was divinely instituted."<sup>4</sup>

Equally explicit are the words of an ancient writer, whose works were attributed to Ambrose. "He (St. Paul) says, it is unworthy of the Lord, whosoever celebrates the mystery otherwise than it was delivered by Him. For he cannot be devout who presumes otherwise than was given by the Author. Therefore, he (the apostle) admonisheth that the mind of him who comes to the eucharist of the Lord should be devout according to the order that has been delivered."<sup>5</sup> Hence we see what the opinion of the ancient fathers was as to the necessity of adhering rigidly to the mode of administering the Eucharist prescribed in the original institution; and we may judge what they would have thought of the "weighty and just reasons" alleged by the Council of Trent and enumerated in the Roman Catechism for refusing the cup to the laity.<sup>6</sup>

Well, but, say the defenders of the Romish doctrine, we admit, and the Council of Trent declares, that our Lord instituted and delivered to the apostles the Eucharist under both kinds. But how does it follow from this that it must of necessity be similarly administered to *all* the faithful? We reply, there is not the slightest hint given by the Evangelists or St. Paul that our Lord designed any difference to exist, in this respect, between the apostles and Christians in general; and, moreover, as no such difference was recognized by the Catholic Church for many centuries, the

onus lies upon the Romish apologist to prove that there is such a difference as to justify the practice of his Church. In other words, he is bound to give some good reason why the words of institution, as regards the cup, are not to be considered as applying to the laity. It is very remarkable that Salmeron, one of the Pope's divines at the Council of Trent, attempted to assign a reason, which, however, was rejected by the other divines. Salmeron said "that we ought to distinguish two times in the institution of the Eucharist—viz., that in which He gave his body, and that in which He gave his blood. That in the former He commanded *all* the faithful, in the persons of the apostles, to receive his body under the species of bread; whilst, in the latter, He commanded none but the priests to drink his blood, when He gave them the cup. This, he said, was clearly proved by the words "Do this, as oft as you shall drink this, in remembrance of me." No wonder that the divines, who were appointed to answer him, rejected such a distinction, founded on such reasoning.<sup>7</sup> They replied, that several doctors, particularly St. Thomas Aquinas, taught that the words "Drink ye all of this" were not addressed to the apostles alone, and in their persons to the priests alone, but to all the faithful. And, in proof that all the faithful were intended, they referred to the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians. So much for Salmeron's solution. The only other shadow of a reason which has ever been attempted to be given, is the assertion that the apostles were, at that time, themselves priests; and, therefore, what was said to them does not apply to the people at large. But, in the first place, how does it appear that the apostles were priests at the time of the institution of the eucharist? Their formal commission as pastors and ministers of the future Church seems most evidently to have been conferred subsequently to our Lord's resurrection, when, as St. John informs us (xx. 21, 22), "Jesus said to them, peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me even so send I you; and when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Spirit." It is, indeed, asserted that the sacerdotal function was conferred by our Lord at the time of institution, by the words "Do this." "In these words" ["Do this"], say the Romish annotators on Luke xxii. 19, "the holy sacrament of order is instituted, because power and commission to do the principal act and work of priesthood is given to the apostles—that is, to do that which Christ then did concerning his body; which was, to make and offer his body as a sacrifice for us and for all that have need of sacrifice, and to give it to be eaten, as Christ's body sacrificed, to all the faithful." They refer to some patristic passages in support of this interpretation. But Dr. Fulke, in his edition of the Romish Testament, has incontrovertibly shown that the fathers appealed to never dreamed of such a notion. In fact, this extraordinary conceit, so utterly foreign from the plain meaning of the passage, is a scholastic subtlety, unknown to all antiquity.

But, even though we were to admit that the apostles were priests at the time of their receiving both species, the admission will only serve to exhibit more plainly the inconsistency of the Romish theory. If the apostles communicated in both kinds as priests, why should the laity be permitted to receive *either* species? why not deny to them, as a necessary consequence, the bread as well as the cup? Again, the Council of Trent decrees that not even all priests are to communicate in both kinds, but only the celebrant or officiating priest. How is this restriction to be reconciled with the fact that all the apostles, though not celebrants, did receive in both kinds?

It is scarcely necessary to say that there is no trace throughout the New Testament writings, which exhibit the history of the infant Church, of any distinction between the presbyters and the people, in respect to receiving the Eucharist. If any such distinction existed, we should expect to find some allusion at least to it in the passage of the 1st epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul speaks at considerable length on the subject of the due observance of this sacrament. But he is entirely silent as to any such distinction; or, rather, the whole drift and scope of his statements and reasonings lead us to conclude that the people, no less than the presbyters, communicated in both kinds. The addresses, warnings, and exhortations contained in the 11th and 12th chapters are evidently general. If any special reference be intended, it would seem that the laity rather than the presbyters were the objects of it. It is far more likely that the former were guilty of partaking in the idol feasts, and profaning the Eucharist, than the latter. Now, one argument by which the apostle seeks to convince the Corinthian Christians of the heinousness of the crime of which they had been guilty is this, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils" (1 Cor. x. 21). This would be no argument to laymen unless they were permitted to drink "the cup of the Lord." And in the 11th chapter, he enforces the duty of self-examination before communion, and of a reverent partaking of the sacrament, in terms which clearly show that all those whom he addresses—laity as well as presbyters—were wont to receive the cup as well as the bread. "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come. Therefore, whoso-

ever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that chalice." (2 Cor. xi. 26-28 Rhem. version.)

Before concluding this portion of our subject, we wish to direct attention to the passage of the Tridentine decree (above quoted) in which particular reference is made to our Lord's discourse in the 6th chapter of St. John's gospel, accompanied with a denial that from it the conclusion can be drawn that our Lord enjoined communion in both species. Assuming that this discourse refers to the Eucharist (as Romish controversialists insist it does, when arguing in favour of Transubstantiation), it appears inevitably to follow from v. 54, *Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you*, and the kindred statements in vv. 55 and 57,<sup>8</sup> that communion in both kinds is essential to all who partake of it. Those words were addressed, not to the apostles, but to the Jews; nor were the apostles at that time priests. The way in which the Tridentine fathers escape this formidable difficulty is more ingenious than satisfactory. They observe that what is said of eating the flesh and drinking the blood in the verses just cited is equally predicated of the bread alone in vv. 59 and 62. Now, if this argument proves anything, it proves too much. For it follows from it that the use of the cup is unnecessary in *all* cases, and may be dispensed with by the priest as well as by the layman.

In conclusion, we will just remark that this discourse of our Lord, in the 6th of John, places the Church of Rome in an awkward dilemma. Either it refers to the Eucharist, or it does not. If it does, it proves one of two things—either that communion in both species is necessary for *all*, or that the cup is not essential in *any* case. If it does not refer to the Eucharist (as many of the most renowned of the Romish divines asserted,<sup>9</sup> when arguing against the Bohemians, who founded upon it their claim to the use of the cup), then its force as an argument against half communion is doubtless evaded, but, at the same time, one of the great strongholds of the dogma of transubstantiation is abandoned; and everything that weakens the proof of Transubstantiation, also, and in the same measure, saps the foundation of the dogma of half communion.

In our next, we hope to discuss this question of communion in one kind, on the ground of historic evidence and patristic testimony; and we shall specially notice the passages referred to by Mr. Power in his letter, inserted in our April number, p. 45.

#### THE WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN IN FRANCE.

THE *Univers* of the 25th April last has a long article exulting in the progress of the age in the worship of the Virgin. It assures us that "our age of light, progress, and philosophy is distinguished by its devotion to the holy Virgin. The worship of the Mother of God never has been, we will not say more popular, but more lively than in our own days, among those at least who wish to remain attached to the Catholic Church. New sanctuaries, consecrated to the Mother of God, are erected in the midst of the acclamations of the people, the old ones are restored, and assume an altogether new splendour." Among other instances which it specially refers to as illustrative of its subject, the *Univers* refers to a statue erected during the last autumn, near Chambéry, in Savoy, in honour of our Lady of Myans. This, it tells us, is a place of pilgrimage, long illustrious, where they venerate a black Virgin (une Vierge noire), remarkable for its numerous miracles for many ages. By the aid of subscriptions collected by the curé of Notre Dame de Myans, this little village now possesses a colossal statue of the Blessed Virgin, placed on the tower of the church.

Some months after the benediction of the statue of our Lady of Myans, by eight bishops and a thousand priests, the coronation of our Lady of Laus attracted to this little valley of the French Alps the same number of bishops, and an almost equal concourse of people. Laus is a place of pilgrimage, less ancient, but not less illustrious than Myans. In the 17th century, a shepherdess of the Alps often received in the solitude of Laus the visits of the Holy Virgin! The present bishop of Gap (perhaps somewhat jealous of the favours bestowed on the neighbouring shepherdess of La Salette) "wished to procure for his favourite church the favours of the holy father, and he therefore becomes its historian, and bears to the sovereign Pontiff the narrative of the wonders of Laus. As soon as Pius IX. had heard it, he wished to offer a crown to the amiable sovereign of this little valley, and the bishop was charged with the duty, in the name of the common father of all the faithful, to place it on the head of the Madonna." We purpose giving elsewhere some further details about "our Lady of Laus," but have only space here to add that the writer in the *Univers* assures us, "that as the greatest sinners shall never be lost, provided only they preserve at the bottom of their hearts respect for the Blessed Virgin, and place their confidence in her, there is reason to believe that the French nation, which thus exalts the worship of Mary, has still, in spite of so many scandals and causes of ruin, sure chances of salvation (des chances assurées de salut)."

<sup>1</sup> It is hardly necessary to notice the puerile distinction which has been invented to support this argument. It is gravely said that as the words "Do this" were spoken after the delivery of the bread, and before that of the cup, the apostles were laymen when they received the former, and priests when they received the latter!

<sup>2</sup> These verses are quoted according to the numbering of the Vulgate and Rhemish version. In the English version, they are numbered respectively 53, 54, 56. <sup>3</sup> Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i. pp. 34, 94.

<sup>1</sup> Hoc sacramentum ordinatur ad spiritualem refectionem que corporali conformatur. Ad corporalem autem refectionem duo requiruntur, scil. cibum, qui est alimentum siccum, et potus, qui est alimentum humidum. Et ideo etiam ad integritatem hujus sacramenti duo concurrunt, scil. spiritualis cibum et spiritualis potus. *Idem*. Ag. Summa, part. 3, q. 73.

<sup>2</sup> The Church of England and Ireland fully recognises such inevitable impediments in a Rubric following the order for the communion of the sick. "But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness . . . or by any other just impediment, do not receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the curate shall instruct him that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth." The unlearned English Church allowed a similar exception. The following Rubric is from an English office (15th century) de extrema unctione: "Deinde communicetur infirmus: noli de vinctis vel alia irroratione probabiliter timeatur; in quo casu dicat sacerdos infirmo, Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides et bona voluntas; tantum crede, et manducasti!" *Blackell*, Mon. Rit. Scil. Augl. i. p. 69.

<sup>3</sup> Cyprianus, *Epistol.* 63, ad Caelitum.

<sup>4</sup> *Idem*.  
<sup>5</sup> Ambrosiaster in 1 Cor. xi. 27. (Ambr. oper. Ed. Bened. II. App. 749).

<sup>6</sup> Those reasons are stated in the Catechism ad Paroch. Pars. II., cap. iv., Qu. lxxv. "In the first place," we are told, "the greatest caution was necessary in order that the blood of the Lord should not be spilled on the ground, which seemed scarcely possible to avoid, if it were administered in a great crowd of people. Besides, as the sacred eucharist ought to be ready for the sick, it was greatly to be feared lest the species of wine, if it were kept too long, should become sour. Besides, there were very many who cannot endure the taste, or even the smell of wine. Moreover, in several countries there is a very great scarcity of wine, nor can it be procured from other quarters without encountering very heavy expense, and very long and difficult journeys." But the chief reason, we are told, was to support and confirm the doctrine of Transubstantiation. "Finally, and what is most pertinent to the matter, the heresy of those was to be uprooted who denied that under either species a whole Christ is contained, and asserted that under the species of bread the bloodless body alone is contained, whilst the blood was contained under the species of wine." The parish priests are referred for other reasons to the writers who have treated of this subject. Among these writers the most eminent was Gerson, who took a leading part in the passing of the decree in the Council of Constance. One of Gerson's reasons is the danger of irreverence and scandal in the reception of the sacrament from the long beards of the laity!

Perhaps our readers will not be dissatisfied with us for diversifying the severer duties of our argumentative essays by a favourite legend of the middle ages, strikingly illustrative of the doctrine of the *Univers* above propounded, that "the greatest sinners are never lost, provided only they put their trust in Mary!" It is, we believe, taken from the celebrated author of "The Golden Legend," *Jacobus de Voragine*, but has been reproduced in London, so lately as 1852, in the "Legends of the Blessed Virgin," translated from the French of J. Collin de Plancy, published by C. Dolman, 61, New Bond-street. As a drama, it was very popular in the sixteenth century, when it was performed under the title of *Le Mystère du Chevalier qui vendit sa Femme au Diable*.<sup>\*</sup> Whether it be deserving of more serious belief than the rest of "The Golden Legend," we think we may safely leave to the judgment of our intelligent readers.

### Legend of the Lord of Champfleury.

"In the twelfth century there lived at Champfleury, in Champagne, a knight, of a more liberal disposition than prudence dictated or his fortune allowed. Abandoning himself to pleasure, he squandered his wealth in feasting, and became a prey to the deepest distress. His friends, devoted to him while partakers of his cheer, deserted him in his poverty. He had married a young lady, whose amiability, modesty, candour, and grace were sufficient to have made him the happiest of husbands. Her dowry had disappeared with the rest, and nothing remained, save an old dilapidated manor-house wherein they resided. But not a murmur passed her lips, nor were questions asked or reproaches given.

"While bewailing his fallen state, a messenger announced to the Lord of Champfleury that the Count of Champagne, his *suzerain*, or superior lord, would shortly pass by his domains, and intended to honour him with a visit. The knight, who was much addicted to vanity and magnificence, fell into a state of despair; and leaving his house, wandered to a retired spot, where he might weep unseen. After an hour's walk, he stopped in the midst of a vast plain, and threw himself on the ground, under the shade of seven stunted walnut-trees. Here he gave full vent to his grief, and endeavoured, in vain, to discover some means of entertaining his future guest in a worthy manner. The day was fast declining (it was in the month of May), when he heard the rapid steps of a knight approaching the spot where he reposed. He hastily dried his eyes; and rising, found in his presence a man of high stature, and of a commanding, but gloomy figure, mounted on an Arab steed as black as ebony. He regarded him attentively, but without being able to recollect having seen him before. The stranger dismounted, and addressing him, said:

"You are suffering from deep grief, Lord of Champfleury. Be not offended at my seeking the cause; but it is, perhaps, not unknown to me. If you will consent to serve me, I will undertake to bring you through your trouble with splendour. I am able to bestow on you much more wealth than you have lost."

"Before replying, the knight paused to examine the stranger. His offer was not very extravagant or astonishing in an age when feudal lords delighted in knight errantry and stirring adventure. But, plainly clad in a suit of black mail, the stranger bore no arms, either on his cloak or his horse's caparisons, which would proclaim the powerful and wealthy lord. Besides, he was alone, having neither page nor servant. At length, the Lord of Champfleury answered:

"I am a vassal of the Count of Champagne. I willingly promise anything which will not cause me to break the pledge of loyalty and homage which I swore to him—that is, after I am convinced of the seriousness of your promise. But first I must know your name."

"If we come to terms, you shall know who I am," replied the stranger. "The homage I shall exact will not interfere with that which you owe to your *suzerain*, the Count of Champagne, who in two days will present himself with a brilliant suite at your gates."

"These last words cruelly revived the agony which the knight had been suffering on this account.

"Whoever you be," said he, after a moment's silence, "and should I lose all but my honour, I am ready to do what you desire, for I was but now dying with despair. But," added he, with earnestness, "I must first learn who you are."

"Well," said the black knight, slowly, "be not dismayed; the terms will doubtless sound strangely in your Christian ears. Your suspicions are being realized. I am he who from an imprudent rebel became a reprobate chief. You understand; you see in me the object of your brethren's fears—the fallen angel who dared to revolt against heaven."

"Satan!" cried the Lord of Champfleury, starting back; and he was about to raise his hand to make the sign of the cross in his defence, when the stranger seized his arm.

"Stay," said he, with a trembling voice; "you are about to insult me, and I am here to save you. Know, I am not your greatest enemy. You are self-abandoned. Without my assistance you are lost. I come to restore you to wealth and honour."

"I doubt you not," said the knight, bitterly; "but I want not your gifts."

"As you will . . . and when the Count of Champagne arrives in two days . . . Well, good bye!"

"The knight trembled. Then, fascinated by a look from the stranger, he continued, with apparent calmness—

"What is the nature of the homage you require of me?"

"Oh! it is nothing very difficult," replied the demon, in as pleasing and friendly a tone as he could assume.

"He appeared to retire a few paces, then he continued—

"I shall exact three things: the first may appear strange to you; but I must have some pledge. The rest will be much easier. You must sell me the eternal salvation of your wife. You must bring her to this spot on this day twelvemonth."

"The knight, although prepared for revolting propositions, was indignant at this. His heart rose in anger. But he was under an influence the effects of which he soon felt; his indignation subsided; his anger cooled; he thought the fallen angel might have exacted something still worse; that a year still remained to take measures for thwarting his adversary; at length he muttered that it was not in his power to do what was required.

"I merely desire you to bring your wife to this place in a year from this day, alone, and without giving her any intimation of our agreement. The rest is my affair."

"The Lord of Champfleury accepted this first condition, and signed with his blood, on a triangular piece of vellum, his promise to fulfil it.

"The eyes of his infernal visitor shone with renewed brilliancy. He then told him that the second condition was to renounce God. The knight's hair stood on end, and he trembled with exceeding fear at this blasphemous proposal. He vehemently exclaimed against it, while the stranger remained silent, as if he felt it necessary to let the first impulses of passion have their way in such an exigency. And when the knight had recovered from his first emotion, he resigned himself to his tempter, thinking he should have ample time to repent in the course of a year. Without daring to raise his eyes to the heavens he renounced, he repeated, trembling the while at his cowardice, the blasphemies which the demon dictated to him, and found sufficient strength to enable him to pronounce the odious words which cut him off from hopes of eternal felicity.

"Thus he placed himself under the power of Satan. With trembling voice—the perspiration pouring down his face—he asked, in despair, what was the third condition of the compact? The demon replied, that this was the last he should require—it was simply that he should renounce the Blessed Virgin. The Lord of Champfleury started back at these words, and felt his courage return. Although well knowing that he had committed the greatest crime man could do, by renouncing his God, the third proposal was to him as the drop of water which causes the glass to overflow.

"Renounce the Blessed Virgin!" said he, "after two acts which are sufficient to damn my soul, to renounce the Mother of God! to forsake the patronage and protection of Mary!"

"The demon trembled at this name.

"If I forsake her," thought the knight, "what support, what refuge, remains for me to effect my reconciliation with God? No," he replied, aloud, "I will not subscribe to this proposition; you have already led me too far; you have ruined me. Release me and let me go."

"He said this with such resolution, that the demon, seeing the uselessness of his insisting, contented himself with what he had already obtained. He greatly insisted on this forbearance, and finally told the knight in what part of his house he would discover immense sums of money and heaps of jewels. After which he mounted his horse, and soon disappeared. The knight sought his mansion in great distress. The treasures were found in the place indicated; he took them, without mentioning to any one the means by which they were discovered, and made great preparations for the expected visitors.

"He received the Count of Champagne with such magnificence, that they who knew how he had squandered his wealth were amazed. He completely bewildered them; and one of the barons in the count's suite, reminding him that St. Bernard was preaching the second crusade, asked if he would not follow his lord's banner under King Louis the Young. To this the knight replied, that not being able to leave his estate he would willingly present two hundred golden crowns to his lordship the Count of Champagne, to assist in the equipment of the troops he proposed to lead to the Holy Land. The count took this large sum with great thanks, and all his court complimented the Lord of Champfleury, who soon increased his domains, embellished his castle, and was more renowned than ever for the sumptuousness of his feasts.

"One circumstance, however, could not fail to be remarked. He had lost all his former gaiety. His countenance was ever shaded with grief. The joy of again possessing riches, the festivities which succeeded one another in his new career, the numerous occupations with which he sought to distract his mind, did not suffice to

stifle the despair he felt at the promise he had made and signed with his blood; his heart was troubled, his slumbers were uneasy, and his pleasures a shadow without any reality. Nor could he bring himself to have recourse to prayer. The moment he entered a church, he felt a trembling come over him, and experienced such anguish of mind, that he was obliged to quit the sacred edifice without assisting at the divine offices. He had determined during the year to reconcile himself with the Almighty; but a wall of iron seemed to separate him from repentance. His gentle spouse had given birth to a son, and but four months had elapsed since this event, when the fatal day arrived.

"The knight, whose pride shrunk from revealing to any one the source whence he had derived his riches, had never mentioned the compact he had made with the demon. As the terrible moment agreed on for its fulfilment approached, he regretted his folly in not having revealed the terrible secret to some holy religious; but now it was too late. One only hope remained. 'Surely,' thought he, 'Heaven will never abandon one so holy and so pure as my sweet spouse!'

"He called her, and saying that he wished her to ride out with him, bade her prepare, while he ordered the horses. The good lady gave her infant to the care of its nurse, said an *Ave*, and followed her husband.

"Shall we be long absent?" she asked.

"Oh, no! we are not going far," replied the embarrassed husband. They mounted and were soon out of sight.

"On their way they passed a chapel, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. The Lady of Champfleury, whose tender devotion to her sweet patroness was well known to her lord, asked permission to enter the chapel; for she never passed an oratory wherein our Lady was especially venerated, without pausing to invoke her protection. The knight assisted his lady to alight, and remained at the door with the two palfreys. After a short prayer the lady reappeared, and the Lord of Champfleury, aiding her to remount, continued his way, his fear and trepidation increasing the nearer they approached the place of their destination.

"Never had his young wife, of whom he felt that he was no longer worthy, at the moment when he was about to be separated from her—never had his sweet Mary (for such was her name) seemed so dear to him. Her modest beauty, the calmness of her fair countenance, her sweet smile, now sweeter than ever, inspired him with a feeling of respect, blended with tenderness. But he dared only to give expression to his feelings in deep sighs. He was the slave of Satan, and he feared him, with whom he was allied, too much to think of breaking his oath; yet he felt that to snatch his dear young spouse from his bosom would be his death. Tears came to his relief, and his breast heaved with emotion when he saw the seven withered walnut-trees, where his interview with the demon had taken place. He drew his horse close to the side of his wife—he tried to take her hand, but dared not.

"Dearest Mary!" said he; but his tears stopped further utterance.

"You weep!" she replied. "You tremble! you are suffering." And she reined in her steed.

"O let us go on," said he; "I dare not delay."

"A feeling had come over him, for which he could not account, but which inspired him with a veneration for his wife, akin to that which is given to the saints in heaven. He dared not turn his eyes towards her; but spurring his horse, hurried on.

"The moment he reached the fatal spot, he saw the dark knight to whom he had sold his spouse approach, followed this time by several esquires, clad, like him, in black. But no sooner had the stranger perceived the lady, than he became pale, trembled, cast his eyes on the ground, and seemed to be paralyzed with fear.

"Perjured man!" cried he, addressing the knight, "is this the manner in which you have fulfilled your oath?"

"What would you?" replied the Lord of Champfleury. "Am I not here at the stated time? Do I not bring you her who is dearer to me than life? But what means this strange conduct?"

"The compact is signed with your blood, base man," interrupted the demon. "You have reaped the fruits of it. Did you not promise to bring your wife to this spot; and instead of her you here present to me my most bitter enemy!"

"The knight was amazed at these words, and boldly proclaimed his honour to be unsullied. He turned towards his companion. A ray of light encircled the countenance of the lady, and as it increased in brilliancy, the black knight drew back, trembling with fear.

"Now, you must know that the Countess Champfleury, on entering the wayside chapel, knelt down in reverence before our Lady's image and commenced her rosary; but no sooner had she said her first *Ave*, than she fell into a deep sleep, when the Queen of Heaven, her most merciful patroness, took her form, and came forth herself to accompany the unhappy knight to the place of meeting.

"The Lord of Champfleury, struck with admiration, felt his spirits revive; and throwing himself off his horse, fell on his knees before the lady, and asked her pardon. He still firmly believed that she was his dear

\* The play of the knight who sold his wife to the Devil!